

C 420 153

NO.

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

at 2:10 p.m.

GERALD ARMSTRONG, et al

AND RELATED CROSS ACTION

THE CONTINUATION OF THE

DEPOSITION OF GERALD ARMSTRONG, taken pursuant to Notice under the California Rules of Civil Procedure, before Michelle Rock, a Notary Public and Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts at the offices of Geller & Weinberg, 80 Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts, on October 30, 1986 commencing

organization	n, I think	makes ther	apy real
difficult.	It's like	a guy out	on the
battlefront	and saying	how come	you're worried

- Q. Does that also apply to your physical ailments?
 - A. Well --
- Q. Do you believe that it makes any sense to treat them until after your litigation is completed?
- A. Well, in a way that's the way I feel about them too. I feel like it will end one day, one way or another. And, when that happens, then I have to regroup and totally restructure my life, my body, my mind.
- Q. You said when you -- settlement, you will feel okay, and then something happens to destroy, to show you that Scientologists are not negotiating in good faith. Do you recall that testimony?

MR. FLYNN: That's so mischaracterized.

- Q. Did you say something to that effect or not?
 - A. Well, what I was saying, we were

discussing whether or not Gerald Armstrong was
one way, just a constant emotional tone
through time, I gave that as an example of
those times when suddenly it looks like maybe
this thing can end. But, those fleeting times
were dashed by what in my opinion, and in my
observation was that bad faith negotiation of
the organization. They have interposed in
each time that settlement has been discussed,
conditions that make it absolutely impossible,
and which evidence their malevolent intent.

- Q. Who have you discussed your nausea with?
 - A. You.
 - Q. Anybody else?
- A. Yes, Joslyn. I don't know who, you know.
- Q. Who have you mentioned your convulsions to other than me?
 - A. Lot of people.
 - Q. Who?
 - A. Mike, my lawyer.
 - Q. You mean Mike Flynn, your lawyer?

MR. FLYNN: Don't talk --

24

1 A. Okay, I never said anything to Mike. 2 MR. FLYNN: No, I'm just telling you don't talk about conversations 3 that we had, that's all. 4 5 Who have you talked about it with? 0. 6 A. God, I hate to give you guys any names. 7 Q. Well, this is a lawsuit that you've 8 filed Gerry, I'm just trying to get some 9 discovery. Who did you talk about the 10 convulsions with? 11 Well, I guess the person who has seen 12 as many convulsions as anyone else, and has 13 you know, wethered them I guess, is sweetheart 14 I had up in Portland, Oregon. 15 Did she see any of your convulsions? 0. 16 A . Yes. 17 Q. How many? 18 I couldn't tell you. A. 19 Was it more than ten? Q. 20 A . I couldn't tell you. 21 0. Could be as many as ten? 22 A . Yes. I mean that period of time, I

Was that the worst time since you left

just in this bottomless depression.

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the Church?

- A. The absolutely worst time, yes. Well, that was -- No, the worst time was before I become involved with her. It was during that time, that two weeks or so that I was on the stand.
- Q. And, you became involved with her shortly after that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And, you were still feeling pretty bad?
- A. Yes, it went on, well, it went on -there was like a slight hiatus, is that a
 correct word? Well, sometime after my arrival
 in Boston, it sort of let go, but then it
 picked up again.
- Q. You discussed with her your physical ailments, the woman in Oregon?
 - A. You know, it's real possible.
- Q. Do you think you may not have discussed your physical ailments with your sweetheart in Oregon?
- A. I don't know, I mean the physical -I mean the physical ailments, the convulsions,
 the incredible depression, the anguish, all of

We Offer Microtranscription		
er Microtra	1	that stuff?
We Off	2	Q. Yes.
	3	A. Oh yes, a lot.
	4	Q. Did you discuss your eating problems
	5	with her?
	6	A. I think she was fairly aware, you know,
	7	she took real good care of me, and she fed me
	8	during that period.
Patent)	9	Q. Did you speak intimately with her
deral —	10	about your ambitions, concerns, and worries?
ate — Fe	11	A. I would say yes.
DEPOSITIONS (State — Federal — Patent)	12	Q. What's her name?
OSITIC	13	A. You already know her name, Debra.
DEF	14	Q. Debra?
	15	A. Debra.
	16	Q. Debra what?
	17	A. That's it, that's all I called her,
	18	Debra.
	19	Q. You know her last name, don't you?
	20	A. Yes.
Ince 1971	21	Q. Where is she located?
Services SI	22	A. Florida.
ty Court Reporting Services Since 1971	23	Q. Where in Florida?
ty Court	24	A. Oh come on, somewhere in Miami.

We Offer Microtranscription TM by		
Microtrans	1	Q. Do you have her address?
We Offer	2	A. I think so.
	3	Q. Will you produce that for us?
	4	A. No.
	5	Q. Did you have any contact with her in
	6	the last couple of weeks in person, or by
	7	phone, or by mail?
_	8	A. Yes.
Federal — Patent)	9	Q. When was your most recent contact?
ederal –	10	A. Last night.
ate — F	11	Q. Do you talk with her on a regular
ons (st	12	basis?
DEPOSITIONS (State —	13	A. No.
DE	14	Q. Who called whom last night?
	15	A. I called her.
	16	Q. You're still friends?
	17	$A \cdot Y \in S$.
	18	Q. What town is she in in Florida?
	19	A. I think Miami.
	20	Q. She works for an attorney?
Since 1971	21	A. As far as I know, yes.
g Services	22	Q. What attorney is that?
ty Court Reporting Services Since 1971	23	A. I don't know.
y Cour	24	Q. Will you produce that for us, Mike,

that	t ado	dre	SS	to	co	ns	sid	er		vhe	th	er she would be	
an :	impo	rta	nt	wi	tne	55	s?						
	Α.	Sh	e's	n	ot.								
						MI	₹.	FL	YN	IN:		I'll let you	
knov	N .												
	Q.	Is	sh	е	an	a t	tto	rn	ey	3			
	Α.	Ye	s.										
	Q.	Is	sh	е	а п	er	nbe	r	οf	: t	he	Florida Bar, do	
you	kno	w?											
	Α.	Yе	s.										
						M	₹.	BL	UM	1EN	SO	N: And, you're	
goi	ng to	0 1	et	us	kn	101	M 3	I	Ć	lid	n '	t hear.	
						ME	₹.	FL	YN	IN:		You've probably	
got	eno	ugh	to	g	et	he	er	no	W	•			
	Α.	Yo	u v	е	got	. 1	tha	t	***		W	hat's that guy	
you	got	do	wn	th	ere		Mu	e1	.1∈	er,	r	ight? He works	
dow	n the	ere	in	M	iam	i.		On	е	of	У	our guys should	
be a	able	to	tr	ac	k d	101	vn	a	pr	ac	ti	cing attorney.	
	Q.	I	wan	t	an	ar	1 S W	er	t	0	th	e question.	
						ME	г.	FL	YN	IN:		You don't need	
an a	answ	er.											
						MI	₹.	BL	UM	IEN	SO	N: I don't know	
her	addi	res	s,	I	don		: k	no	W	wh	0	knows her	

address if anybody, I'm asking you for it.

You can either refuse, or you can say you'll
give it us later or you can say you'll think
about it, but why don't you make the record
clear on it.
MR. FLYNN: Next question.
MR. BLUMENSON: You won't do
any of those things?
MR. FLYNN: Next question.
MR. BLUMENSON: I take that
as a refusal.
MR. FLYNN: You can take it
any way you want. It's like asking what Roger
Geller's address is, even if you don't know it
you could look it up in the in many
publications. Right Roger?
MR. GELLER: Do you know
where I live?
Q. Prior to joining the Church or hearing
about Scientology, did you ever commit an act
of prostitution.
MR. FLYNN: Don't answer
that. Next question.
Q. Do you have homosexual experience?

MR. FLYNN:

Don't answer

anscriptio		
We Offer Microtranscriptio	1	that. Next question.
We Off	2	Q. Were you a homosexual before you
	3	joined the Church?
	4	MR. FLYNN: Don't answer
	5	that.
	6	Q. Did the Church of Scientology cure you
	7	of homosexuality?
	8	MR. FLYNN: Next question.
Patent)	9	Don't answer that.
DEPOSITIONS (State — Federal — Patent)	10	Q. Did the Church of Scientology cure you
e – Fed	11	of drugs?
NS (Sta	12	MR. FLYNN: Don't answer
OSITIO	13	that.
DEP	14	Q. Did the Church of Scientology
	15	MR. GELLER: Is there a
	16	reason that you're
	17	MR. BLUMENSON: No, he's
	18	made his record clear.
	19	Q. Did the Church of Scientology cure you
	20	of criminal behavior or tendencies?
10e 1971	21	MR. FLYNN: Don't answer
ervices Si	22	that.
ty Court Reporting Services Since 1971	23	Q. Did the Church of Scientology
ty Court F	24	MR. FLYNN: I'll tell you

U	what, I'll let you ask him if the Church of
	Scientology cured him of anything. I'll let
	you ask that broad question. Okay?
	MR. BLUMENSON: I'm going to
	choose the questions.
	MR. FLYNN: If you want,
	I'll ask him. Did the Church of Scientology
	cure you of anything?
	MR. BLUMENSON: You've got
	your turn at the end of my examination.
	MR. FLYNN: Would the answer be no?
	A. Answer would be no.
	MR. FLYNN: Okay, the record
	is clear. All the rest does is give you any
	latitude to pry into his personal life.
	MR. BLUMENSON: Well, I have
	a right to examine this witness, Mr. Flynn,
	and one of the things I can examine him on in
	my opinion is whether he committed crimes
	before he joined, and whether the Church of
	Scientology cured him of criminal behavior or
- 1	

tendencies; whether he was a homosexual before

he joined, and whether the Church of

Scientology cured him of that; whether he was a prostitute before he joined or committed acts of prostitution before he joined, and whether the Church of Scientology cured him of that. And, your conclusionary question and answer does not sufficiently substitute for my rights of discovery, and you know that. But, if you want to insist --

MR. FLYNN: I know what I know, you don't have to tell me. You've got the record, and the record is clear. You do not have the latitude, Mr. Blumenson, to pry into matters that are none of your business. Whether he was a member of the Hopi Indians and believes in marijuana, that is irrelevant for the purposes of this litigation.

MR. BLUMENSON: Then you ought to take another look at this Complaint, Mike.

Q. Did you sell drugs prior to joining the Church of Scientology?

MR. FLYNN: Don't answer.

Q. Isn't it a fact that you sold ten grams of hashish in the spring or summer of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	196	9	3			
ı						

MR. FLYNN: Don't answer.

- Q. Isn't it a fact that you sold mescaline to friends of yours in the summer of 1969?
- MR. FLYNN: Don't answer.
- Q. Isn't it a fact that until you joined the Church of Scientology you were a drug seller?

MR. FLYNN: Don't answer.

Q. Isn't it a fact that after you joined the Church of Scientology that you never sold drugs?

MR. FLYNN: Don't answer.

- Q. What statements do you say were revealed in violation of confidence from your auditing folder to third persons?
- A. Well, without revealing those ones, I can give you a list of the dates --
- Q. No. I want to know, you have complained that certain confidential information was revealed to certain persons.

MR. FLYNN: His whole

auditing file was culled, that's our position.

So there is no misunderstanding at the trial our position is that his entire auditing files were culled with everything that's in it, regardless of the contents of what's in it, by the guardians office, and by intelligence officers of the Church for use by them and by the private investigators and by its' attorneys, that's our position, without regard to the contents of any specific file.

MR. BLUMENSON: We have a right to inquire into your position. We have to prove that your position is wrong. And, the first question is, what information was given to a third person that you have placed in your Complaint? You have said confidential information was given to third persons, I'm asking what that confidential information was.

 $$\operatorname{\mathtt{MR.}}$$ FLYNN: The information in the auditing files. Next question.

Q. Well, did you see any of this confidential information used at any time after you left the Church by somebody who wasn't authorized to have it?

MR. FLYNN: You can answer

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

H					
	400	h	*	4-	
П		8.3	673		-

- A. Yes.
- Q. And, what's the most recent example?
- A. You're asking these questions right now which were obtained from pre-clear folders.
- Q. The question I asked about whether you were a prostitute, that's from your P.C. folder?
- You are not going to find that language in there, that's your construction of whatever the incident was. So, you label it however you want to. But, wherever the initial the first time you'll ever find any mention of anything like that from Gerald Armstrong is in my supposedly confidential pre-clear folders, where I'm the absolutely sitting duck controlled pre-clear bearing his -you know, perhaps not totally brilliantly clear soul, but nevertheless his soul, and telling whatever it is. That's where it first appeared.
 - Q. I'm not asking where it first appeared.
 - A. That's --
 - Q. Where did I get it from, your

			-		-						166	-		-	et e			1000000	
C	0	n	T	1	d	0	n	t.	1	a	1	f	0	1	d	0	r	3	

- A. You got it from those third parties who took it out of my pre-clear folder.
- Q. So, the only source of it was the pre-clear folder?
- A. The only source of it is the memory of Gerald Armstrong and the statements made in trust to that organization. That's the source of it.

MR. FLYNN: It's clear to anyone who ever looks at any of these issues that all of your information on any personal or intimate aspect of an individual's life come from these folders. Anyone who has ever looked at these issues, it's as blatant as the sun coming up in the morning.

MR. BLUMENSON: You think I have a right to ask questions when you put that in the Complaint?

MR. FLYNN: I think you have a right to ask some questions.

MR. BLUMENSON: And, that's what I intend to do right now.

A. So, your position is that the rapist,

in	order	to p	rove	hi	. 5	case,	gets	to	fuck	the
Vic	ctim?	Give	me	a k	re	eak.				

- Q. Gerry, here's what I want to ask you --
- A. You've been asking me to legitimize the details which you've illegitimately taken from my pre-clear folders. I may be crazy, but I'm not stupid.
- Q. Okay, I just want to ask you -
 MR. FLYNN: He happens to be exactly correct.
- Q. Did you tell anyone other than your auditor, if you told your auditor, that you had had homosexual sex for pay?
- A. Mr. Blumenson, to reiterate that, everything which I have said or written was within that same context of offered --
 - Q. I'm asking this particular issue.
- A. Oh shut up, listen to me. Of offered, guaranteed, promised trust by that organization. We will never -- man has so often been betrayed, we will never -- Come on, the guy was sitting there counting his -- running his diamonds through his hands, his gold bars, while blood dripping from his

- fangs as he is reading through people's pre-clear folders. And, you can tell that from the L. Ron Hubbard Goodrich Eval.
 - O. Listen --
- A. Same technique was used on Goodrich as used on Armstrong, the same G.O. mentality.

 You're trying to legitimize this thing through documents that were raped, stolen from my mind, because I had offered those things in that context of trust. I'm not going to talk about it, you go screw yourself.
- Q. Let me just say something now, I believe it's an issue Q.--

MR. FLYNN: Want to take a break here?

- A. No, I'm fine.
- Q. Did you, I want to be specific on the issue I have raised, not that everything I know comes from your auditing file, I want to know --

MR. FLYNN: You're so offensive it's beyond belief. Can't you see what this subject does to the witness? If you want to know --

		MR.	BLU	MENSO	N:	Mike	, you	
should ne	ver have	put	it	into	your	Com	plain	t
that perso	onal info	rmat	ion	was	diss	emin	ated	to
third par	ties.							

MR. FLYNN: That's what your organization, and your founder were famous for, this precise thing.

MR. BLUMENSON: Look, there are two important things in this context, one is --

MR. FLYNN: Yes, asking him about --

MR. BLUMENSON: Wait a

second. One is whether Scientology helped or hurt him, damaged him or helped him, that's definitely an issue. The second issue is whether Scientology took confidential information from auditing files and disseminated it to third persons, which apparently means that there has to be an issue as of evidence as to that, what information was given, who was it given to and so on. My only motive in asking these questions is on those two elements. Now --

1 MR. FLYNN: I wouldn't believe your motives as you stated them, Mr. 2 3 Blumenson, for all the tea in China. MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not 4 5 going asking you to believe me, I'm not even 6 asking you not to insult me any more, I'm just 7 asking you to let me conduct this deposition in a professional manner. 8 9 Now, my question is specific, and the question is did you tell anyone, after you 10 11 joined the Church did you tell any 12 Scientologists about an experience of 13 homosexual experience, sex for pay prior to 14 your entry into the Church outside of auditing? 15 Outside of A . 16 MR. FLYNN: Let's say 17 outside of confidentiality. 18 MR. BLUMENSON: 19 deciding the questions. 20 MR. FLYNN: I'm telling you 21 that the word auditing means confidentiality. 22 MR. BLUMENSON: Well, I'm 23 sorry Mike, that is not for you to change the

You know,

questions or to give the answers.

we're going to have to go to court over so many of these things needlessly.

Q. Now, did you tell any Scientologists about homosexual sex for pay prior to your entry into the Church outside of an auditing session?

MR. FLYNN: That means outside of confidentiality.

A. No.

Q. Now, did you say it outside of an auditing session --

MR. FLYNN: That means confidentiality.

MR. BLUMENSON: I think that we may have to go to court and I'm going to take a one minute break to consult. We may have to go to court right now. This is totally outrageous behavior. I get to ask the questions Mike, you get to cross-examine later. You don't get to revise the questions consistently like that.

MR. FLYNN: Let me know.

(Discussion held off the record.)

	MR. FLYNN:	Kindly	on the
record refrain	from any furt	her emoti	onal
outbursts again	st my client,	Mr. Blum	nenson.

MR. BLUMENSON: I don't know what you're talking about Mr. Flynn. I find your conduct offensive, I find it totally obstructive, and I've been asking these questions in good faith.

- Q. Now, I want to know whether you -you said that the only times that you talked
 about homosexual acts for pay to
 Scientologists was in confidentiality,
 remember that question and answer?
- A. Well, you're talking, you have pluralized what is probably listed even on your sheet as a single act. So, I would have to have some objection to the way you worded that.
- Q. Okay, a single act of homosexual sex for pay.
 - A. That is out of my pre-clear folders.
- Q. Did you ever write it or say it to someone outside of the pre-clear folders?

 MR. FLYNN: I object. I

- don't know what that means. The issue is confidentiality, not isolation to the pre-clear folder.
- Q. How do you know it's in your pre-clear folders?
- A. Well, just going on your admissions, just going on the organizations admissions that it's in my pre-clear folder.
- Q. I didn't tell you it was in your pre-clear folder, did I?
- A. No, but other attorneys of record on this case have, people who culled my folders, Long, and whoever the other rest of the people were that did this act, listed all of these things in this document, and it's one of these items here which is blacked out.
- Q. Did you see it before it was blacked out? I mean, you're looking at what, the objections, correct?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. The objections on the production of the P.C. file. Did you see it in those objections at some point?
 - A. I think I've already said that. If in

your contor	ted way you're atte	mpting to	get
statements,	you know, you're a	ttempting	to
legitimize	that criminal act,	it isn't	going
to work, an	d I'm not going to	fall for	it. So
any discuss	ion of this subject	matter, a	and
there is no	admission that it	even happe	ened,
but it came	from my pre-clear	folders.	

Q. Did you tell that information about a homosexual act for pay prior to your entry to Scientology, did you tell that to anyone who was not an auditor?

MR. FLYNN: It's on the record that he only gave it in confidence. So don't answer any other questions about it.

MR. BLUMENSON: Wait a second Michael, what you're doing is outrageous and totally unprofessional. I'm asking a question that's highly relevant. The question is, was that fact a product of culling of confidential files, or was it obtained in another way. You have placed that in issue, and I have a right to question, and you are not permitting me to question except by changing my question with your own

1	n	t	6	r	r	u	D	t	1	0	n	S	6

MR. FLYNN: If you want to go to Judge Breckenridge and get an order, do so. Judge Breckenridge tells us to answer, we will. Next question.

- Q. Is everything that you say in Scientology to a Scientologist confidential?
 - A. Well, I would say no to that.
- Q. Okay. What written pledges are there of confidentiality of Scientology that you saw?
- A. It's throughout the whole literature. We have no interest in what you've done before, it will never be held against you as long as you tell the truth.

So, you tell the truth and a little while later here the same document comes back to haunt you, given in trust, that trust violated. That trust was obtained by fraud to begin with by promises of confidentiality, by promises of honesty ethics, et cetera, and it's violated.

Q. All right, what written documents promised you that statements that you made would not be repeated to third parties?

be used against you.

	Α.	I w	ill b	e ab	le to	find	it with	in your
own	lite	rati	ure.					
	Q.	Wel	l, te	11 me	e to	the be	st of yo	our
reco	ollec	tion	n wha	t the	ey ar	e?		
	Α.	Basi	icall	y wha	at th	is sta	tement i	is. We
have	e no	100 100 I						
	Q.	Aud	itors	code	e?			
	Α.	Well	l, th	e aud	ditor	s code	is cert	tainly
part	of	it.						
						r docu	ment tha	àt
pron	nises	COI	nfide	ntia.	lity?			
				MR.	• FLY	NN: D	on't yel	ll at my
clie	ent.							
				MR.	. BLUI	MENSON	: I m r	not
yell	ling.							
	Α.	The	answ	er i	s yes	•		
	Q.	Is t	there	any	claritine reflution	and w	hat docu	ument is
it?								
				nd i				
7			you	tell	me t	ne gis	t of the	2
docu	ument							
	A	What	t I'v	e to.	Id you	u beio	re. We	have no

The only problem you're

going to have is if you don't tell.

So you tell, and you get it, you get it from a guy like you sitting across this table.

Q. Does that document purport to say that it's not going to be given to a third person, the one that you're referring to now that you can't name?

A. What the document purports, what the body of Scientology which is given to the unitiated as they move up the toll bridge is that whatever you say to us, it will never be used against you. We have no interest in prior indiscretions. We have no interest in those things. Those things will never be used against you. Your trust has been violated in the past, that's why you're here with us now, we'll never betray you. That's the gist of the promises of Scientology.

The truth is, it's a criminal organization operated by criminals who will use anything, anything which they can construe, and you do construe it as smut, you do want to use it against me.

criptio		
We Offer Microtranscriptic	1	Q. Did you talk about your homosexual
We Offer	2	experience for pay with your family?
	3	Is that a refusal to answer,
	4	or do you wish more time?
	5	A. No, I'm trying to make sense of the
	6	question.
	7	Q. Did you tell anyone in your family
_	8	that you had had sex with a man for pay prior
· Patent)	9	to 1969?
DEPOSITIONS (State — Federal — Patent)	10	MR. FLYNN: Don't answer
te – F	11	that.
NS (Sta	12	A. The answer is no.
OSITIC	13	MR. BLUMENSON: This
DEP	14	information is directly at issue from your
	15	Complaint.
	16	MR. FLYNN: He answered it.
	17	Q. The answer is no?
	18	A. Correct.
	19	Q. Did you tell any non-auditor that
	20	information?
ıce 1971	21	MR. FLYNN: This is the same
Services Sir	22	MR. BLUMENSON: I want an
ty Court Reporting Services Since 1971	23	answer to that question. I consider it key to
ty Court F	24	MR. FLYNN: His testimony is

he	only	gav	е	this	informa	tion	in	confidence	to
the	Chur	ch	of	Scie	entology	•			

MR. BLUMENSON: That's what you have coached him to say by refusing to allow any other terminology in the question.

I have asked my own question and you won't let it get answered.

A. Listen, you keep making this allegation that he's coached me and he's never coached me.

MR. BLUMENSON: Gerry, the question is ridiculous. I say, did you say it in auditing, he won't let you answer it. And says no, for auditing read confidentiality.

MR. FLYNN: You should get a lawyer who can ask questions.

A. You want to know my status on this -
MR. BLUMENSON: I want to

know whether he said it outside of auditing,

and I'm not going to be satisfied until I get

an answer to it.

A. I'll give it to you, I've never said, never discussed it with anyone outside of the Scientology context.

session?

homosexual sex for pay outside of an auditing

24

that correct?

1	MR. FLYNN: It's been asked
2	and answered.
3	MR. BLUMENSON: It has not
4	been answered, and I've been trying my hardest
5	to get an answer.
6	MR. FLYNN: In the previous
7	context it's been asked and answered.
8	MR. BLUMENSON: It has not,
9	I don't regard
10	MR. GELLER: He's going to
11	answer the question.
12	A. The answer is no. Now, hold on
13	MR. BLUMENSON: That's all I
14	wanted to know.
15	A. Now, I know and you know that you have
16	a document down there, possibly typed by me,
17	in which you have that line, because the G.O.
18	wanted that for what purpose, for clearance to
19	go to S.U., not for not for future
20	litigation. S.U., capital S, capital U.
21	Q. So, you gave that information not only
22	in auditing, but on a G.O. application, is

No.

MR. FLYNN:

Q. Outside of sessions, is that correc	t?
MR. FLYNN: The answer is	
the G.O. had the information in their own	
files, and it was transposed to another fil	e.
MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not	
asking you for the answer, Mr. Flynn.	
MR. FLYNN: It was given	in
confidence, Mr. Blumenson.	
MR. BLUMENSON: This is a	
total abuse, you're trying to obscure, and	
obstruct an obvious major issue in this cas	е,
you're trying to destroy and abuse discover	У
Mr. Flynn. And, you're laughing now, but i	t's
not funny. What you're engaging in is two	big
shenanigans. It's ridiculous, it's a total	
disruption of this deposition.	
MR. FLYNN: Mr. Blumenson	,
number one, please stop yelling at me.	
MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not	
yelling at you, and I'm trying to conduct t	his
in a professional manner.	
MR. FLYNN: Then go back	to

MR. BLUMENSON:

Well, I've

law school and learn how.

	n	е	V	е	r		a t		a		d	e g	00	S	it	i	0	n	(James of	bе	е	n	j	. n		а	á	si	t	ua	a t	ti	01	n				
	W	h	е	r	e		Ι	С	a	n	3	t	а	S	K	a		q I	1 (e s	t	i	or	1	W	i	tl	no	u	t	3	y o	u					
	r	е	p	h	r	a	Si	. n	g		t	hε	3	q	u e	S	t	i) [n,		a	n ć	1	f	0	r	ci	n	g	1	t h	е					
	W	1	t	n	е	S	S	t	0		a	n s	5 W	е	r	n	0	t	Ī	n y		q	u e	2 8	t	i	01	1	b	u	t	W	h	a t		ус	u	
	W	a	n	t		t	h€	į	g	u	e	s t	i	0	n	a	n	d	4	an	S	W	er		t	0	k	ое										
																M	R	•	· ·	FL	Y	N	N:			P	1	e a	S	е	å	st	0	р				
	У	е	1	1	i	n	g.	•																														
-																M	R	٠	1	BL	U	M	ΕN	IS	0	N			W	е	1 1	re	(go	i	ng		
	t	0		t	a	k	е	а		f	í	V€	2	m	in	u	t	е	policely	or	е	a	k.	,														
					A	•		A	n	đ	,	1		W	an	t		to)	р	u	t	C	n		t	h e	9	r	e	20	or	d	t	h	at		
	M	r	•		F	7	уr	n		h	a	S	n	е	ve	r		f) 1	r c	9	d	n	ne		t	0	S	a	У	ë	a n	У	th	i	ng	•	
	Н	e		h	a	S	r	ı e	V	e	r		seeth	Admin		i	f	-	16	9	е	V	er		S	u	g	ge	S	te	9 (£						
	a	n	У	t	h	i	nç	1		I	,	c]	e.	a	rl	У		e 1	7 6	a 1	u	a	tε	2	t	h	a t	-	a	g	а:	i n	S	t	t	he		
-	d	a	t	a		t	h a	t		I		h a	i V	e			H	е	(do	е	S	r	10	t		f€	e e	đ	Ĭ	n e	9	al	n s	W	er	S	P
-	h	е		d	0	е	S	n	0	t		f€	e	d	п	l e		1	9 (g a	1		tŀ	ı e	0	r	1 6	e s	,	- Section 1	ne	9	d	ое	S			
	n	0	t		f	е	e c	ì	m	е	,	a	W	a	У	t	0			i v	е	1	m y	7	1	i	fe	è .										
-																M	R	0	The same	BL	U	M.	ΕN	IS	0	N	0		A	1.		r	í	g h	t	1		
	1	e	t	ğ	S		si	t		d	0 1	wr	1,		an	d		We	2	1	1	1	n c	W		r	e s	s u	m	e.								
					A	•		I	t	8	S		u	S	t	n	0	t	904	ci	g	h	t.															
																M	R		1	BL	[]	M	EN	IS	0	N	0		Ι	8 1	n	n	0	-				

MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not saying that you're forced to do anything, I'm saying that Mr. Flynn, and Mr. Tabb yesterday totally abused this by feeding answers which you may or may not have adopted. I'm not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

impugnin	g y	our	integrity	Gerry, I	think the
conduct	of	your	attorney	has been	outrageous.

62

A. If my integrity is not being impugned here, then what is?

MR. BLUMENSON: That's going to be for the jury to decide, it's not for me What the problem is the gross, to decide. absolutely grotesque violation of rules of court which this is supposed to be conducted I have never seen in court or any other deposition a situation where a lawyer's question is blocked by the other counsel who replaces which he doesn't like with other words. I've never seen a situation where a lawyer's question is answered in a whisper by the lawyer on the other side to the witness. These kind of things have no place deposition, they're a waste of time, they're an obstruction, they're unprofessional, they're totally unethical and they're a subordination of perjury if Mr. Armstrong rose to the bait.

MR. FLYNN: For the record, we're obviously -- since Mr. Blumenson has

	Q (, m	III () I	1 5	5 C	r	a	E	e	a		a	(3 1	C 6	3 6	1 [Q	9	d	1		0	L		e)	III C) (. J.	O	n	a.	1.						
-	aı	a	t	a ç	gc	n	i	S	m		t	0	W	a ı	c (ds	3	n	n e		a	n	d		t	0	W	a	r	a É	Š	m	У		C	1:	i e	n	t,		
	W	9	1	C 6	9	ĺ	n		a	n		a	r	e a	a	() t		g	r	е	a	t		e	m	0	t	ic	o n	a	1									
	S	e :	n i	3 3	i t	i	V	i	t	У	,		n	0 1	t	() I	1]	- У		M	r	•		В	1	u	m	er	าร	50	n	,								
The second second	a	p	p a	a 1	C €	n	t	1	У	F		b	u	t		Ι	(I ë	n		S	t	а	t	е		f	0	r	t	: h	е		r	е	C	or	d	,		
The second second	d	9	f:	i r	n i	. t	е	1	У		f	0	r	1	0 (D 1	t I	1	m	У	S	e	1	f		a	n	d	Ī	n y	7	С	1	ì	е	n t	6				
	S	1	n] €	9	W	е	8	r	е		i	n	1	t I	ni	Ĺ£	3	a	r	е	a		0	f		p	r	e-	- C	: 1	е	a	r							
	i	Ω	f) 1	c n	ı a	t	i	0	n		a	n (d		i r	נ נ	Ēc	r	II	a	t	i	0	n	•	g	i	V e	e n	l										
	C	O	n :	E :	ić	le	n	t	i	a	- James	1	У	1	t)	alessed.	: t	ı e		C	h	u	r	C	h	,	0	f	S	S C	i	е	n	t	0.	Lo	g	у,		
	11	7	() 1	c d	le	r		t	0		d	ż	f:	£	u s	5 6	791	t	h	е		р	r	0	b	1	e :	m	W	ı h	i	С	h		Mı	. 0				
	В	1	u I	n e	e n	S	0	n		h	a	S		ra	a :	ĹS	3 6	e c	1	t	0		a		p	i	n	n	a c	:1	e		0	f							
	e	m	0 1	t:	ic	n	a	1		f	е	r	V	0 1		0]		W	0	u	1	d		S	u	b	m	1 1	es un	a		S	i	m	p.	L e)			
	S)	11	11	i	. 0	n		M	r	4		В	1 1	u I	n e	e r	1 5	50	n		i	S		S	i	m	p	1)	Į	t	0		a	S	k	t	h	е		
	W.	i	tı	1 (3 5	3 S		W	h	е	t	h	e:	r]	h e	3	ŀ	c n	0	W	S		0	£		a.	n	У	i	. n	£	0	r	m	a t	ī i	0	n	i	n
	h	i	S	Ì	or	е	eturps	С	1	е	a	r		f	Э.	1 (Ì	e r	•	t	h	a	t		h	e	1	g	a t	J ∈	<u> </u>	0	u	t	S	i	de		o f		a
	C	0	n:	E :	i c	le	n	t	i	a	1		S	e i	t '	t :	i. ľ	ıç	•			I		W	0	u	1	d	ě	3 U	ıb	m	i	t		tl	n e	:			
	aı	n	Sī	√ €	er		i	S		0	b	V	1	0 1	u i	5]	L	Į.	9	0	i	n	g		t	0		b	е	ç	ľ	V	е	n		tl	n e				
	q.	u	a.	L	i. t	У		a	n	đ		C	h	a i	r	a (2 1	: €	r		0	f			a.	***		1	m :	ĹS	t	a	k	e	n						
	C	h	a 1	s a	3 C	t	е	r	-	Z	a	t	i	01	1	ć	a k) (u	t		1	n	f	0	r	m	a	ti	LC	n		W	h	i	c l	1	У	ου	l	
	p	r	e r	V :	i c	u	S	1	У		b	r	0	u	9 1	h t	-	ι	ı p) /		t	h	е		a	n	S	WE	er		i	S		g	0 :	i n	g	t	.0	
	be	9	(o k	V	i	0	u	S	1	У		t	h a	a 1	t	udani	1 6)	h	a	S		n	е	V	e:	r	Ĩ	n a	d	е		S	u	c i	1				
	d	i	S	3 .	l c	S	u	r	е	S	•																														
																	5	C t	ı e	r	е	f	0	r	е	1		i	f	У	70	u		h	а	VE	9				
	S	p	e (~ .	i f	i	C		i	n	đ	i	V	i	j	u a	a .		5	0	r		S	p	е	C	i	£	í	3	i	n	S	t	a	n	3 6	S			

W	he	r	9	h	е	and a	n a	S	9	gi	V	0	n		Sl	1 C	h		st	a	t	0	m e	n	t	S	/	in	l	01	: d	eı	C
t	0	g	i v	е		а	1	i	t	t l	e		S	p	9 (: i	. f	i	Сi	. t	У		tc)	t	h	е	qυ	е	SI	i	01	n ,
I	W	0	u l	đ		Sl	ıb	m	i	t	t	h	a	t	3	/ C	u		br	i	n	g	t	h	0	S	е	up			A	n	d,
i	£	У	o u	ĺ	h	a v	7 e		a	n	i	n	đ	i,	v j	L C	u	a	1	1	i	k	e	J	0	h	n	Sn	ıi	tl	7 /	(o r
W	ho	е	v e	r]	Mr			A	rπ	S	t	r	01	n ç	3	m	a	У	h	a	V	е	S	a	i	đ	SC	m	e t	: h	iı	n g
t	0,		in		0	rc	i e	r		to)	r	е	f	re	2 5	s h		hi	. 5		r	e c	0	1	1	e c	ti	. 0	n	У	0	u
b	ri	n	g	u	р	1	: h	е		n a	m	е	1	J	o t	n	l	S	mi	. t	h	9											

But, to just arbitrarily go on a fishing expedition in such a sensitive area, which would be sensitive to anyone's life, not only yours, but Mr. Armstrong, but to anyone in this room with these broad questions in the way that you have, is completely inappropriate. It doesn't recognize the subtleties in this particular litigation in this particular area, and all of your discovery can be completed with appropriate questions, with sufficient specificity to avoid and diffuse the problem that we have.

Q. Did you ever tell anyone other than an auditor that you sold drugs prior to your joining Scientology?

MR. FLYNN: That is just

such	a s	pec	if	ic	V	io	1	a	ti	.0	n	of	wha	t	I	jus	t
sugge	ste	dt	0	be	a	Q	0	0	d	p	ro	ce	dure				

MR. BLUMENSON: You are not the judge.

MR. FLYNN: You are going to have let the judge answer, we're going to put their procedure before the judge.

Don't answer, next question.

Q. Do you believe that information as to whether you sold drugs prior to joining Scientology was taken out of your pre-clear folders and revealed to third persons?

MR. FLYNN: You can answer

that.

A. Well, let me put it this way. Just so that, you know, again, you're hoping that by putting this on the record in this way you can go down the list of items which have been culled from the pre-clear folders to legitimize it. Right? Because here it is, here's Armstrong talking about it in the deposition, so it can be appear in Freedom, or the latest television show, or, you know, when Gerald Armstrong does become -- does make

- his million and does become famous as a writer and artist, you can have it surface then, right?
- Q. Gerry, I'm only responding to a
 Complaint that you have filed in which you
 claim as one of your major counts that
 confidential information was obtained from
 your pre-clear files and used against you, and
 I'm going to get to the bottom of that.
 Either we're going to stipulate that cause of
 action away, or I'm going to ask questions
 about it. And, no matter how much obstruction
 Mr. Flynn puts into this case, it's going to
 have to be answered sooner or later.
- Q. Is the drug sale issue one of those things which you're claiming was obtained from the P.C. file and used against you?
- A. Anything that has to do with drugs, sales of drugs, all of those things, yes. I'm going to hand you a copy of what the organization -- you know, you claim, let's drop the cause of action, or whatever it is about the culling of pre-clear files.
 - Q. I said if you don't drop it I'm going

to	ask :	it.	If	you	do	drop	it,	then	there	is
no	need	to	ask	vou	epes no					

A. Okay, then I'm going to give you the product, and I've deleted those things, because they're not necessary in order to prove the fact of the culling. There are admissions here: October 16, 1977, and I thank Mr. Randall for using the term Minister, Armstrong informs his Minister that —— and, then Armstrong informed his Minister that —— On September 2, 1977, Armstrong confessed to his Minister that —— on May 5, 1977, Armstrong informed his minister that ——

Q. Gerry --

A. On February 20, 1977 Armstrong informed his minister that -- on February 26, 1977 Armstrong described the -- Armstrong admitted to his Ministers on numerous occasions that -- See examples, March 26, 1970 and July 16, 1970 statements.

Q. Can I ask you now -- That's in the case, it's filed, there is no question about that, you don't need to read it all.

The point I want to ask you

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- is, prior to that objection being filed on July 3, 1986 in response to an order to produce and index these files, prior to that time --
 - A. In response to an order to produce --
- Q. Following an order to produce and index the files.
 - A. So this is just as --
- Q. Prior to July 3, 1986 when this was filed -- Can I finish my question?
 - A. No, no, you can't finish your question.
- Q. I'm going to rephrase the question.

 Prior to July 3, 1986 when this order was

 filed --
- A. Hold on, that's not an order, that's the objection.
 - Q. When this objection was filed.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Prior to July 3, 1986, when this objection was filed, was information about your drug sale history disseminated to other people?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Was it disseminated to other people

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

22

24

wit	h	the	2	inf	or	ma	t:	io	n		COMM ASSOCI		W	ı a	S	1	: h	е	i	n.	f	or	m a	at	io	n
dis	sse	mir	a	ted		4000 440		0	bt	c a	in	e	Ė	f	r	o I	n	У	ου	ır]	pr	e-	- C	le	ar
fil	e?																									
	A		T	he	to	ta	1	it	У	0	£	P	. (fi	1	е	S	W	eı	: e				
dis	se	mir	ı a	ted	t	.0	01	th	er	*** **	pe	0]	ρl	. е		V	v h	а	t '	S		in	r	ny	P	C.

Q. Was the drug history obtained from your P.C. file, is it encompassed in your Complaint when you say --

file is in my P.C. file.

MR. FLYNN: Do you have the

P.C. file?

MR. BLUMENSON: I do not have the P.C. file.

MR. FLYNN: Your clients

have the P.C. files, they can look Mr.

16 Blumenson so we can avoid this whole area.

17 They gave them to the court, they indexed them,

18 they looked at them, they obviously picked out

what they thought was juicy, tittilating and

20 interesting to people such as yourself. They

21 wrote it down, they got the files, so they

know the answer to that question. So, why

23 cause problems?

Q. I want to know whether drug

information whether your Complaint in	
which you say confidential information from	
the P.C. file was disseminated to third	
persons, does that include information about	
your selling drugs disseminated to third	
persons prior to July 3, 1986?	
MR. FLYNN: You don't have	
to answer. I'll tell you what exactly it	
includes.	
MR. BLUMENSON: No, I'm not	
asking you	
MR. FLYNN: It includes	
every word, comma, syllable, punctuation mark	۲,
everything on the four square corners of the	
P.C. file, everything that's in there which	
you have possession of, that's the answer.	
MR. GELLER: Mr. Flynn, are	3
you inviting us to take your deposition now?	
MR. FLYNN: No, I'm invitin	19
you to, if you want to recull them, recull	
them for purposes of figuring out what you've	<u>}</u>
already culled.	
MR. BLUMENSON: Well, we	

But, I'm

will in response to your invitation.

worked.

trying to get some very basic information on a
basic claim that you have injected into this
case. And, the question is, did the are
you claiming that the only source of the drug
sale information which you say was
disseminated to third persons was the P.C.
file?
MR. GELLER: It's a simple
question.
A. Here's the way it works
Q. No, I want an answer. Can you answer
that?
A. No. I can't answer that.
Q. Was it culled only from the pre-clear
file, or could it have been obtained from
another source?
MR. FLYNN: He said he
couldn't answer yes or no. Next question.
MR. GELLER: You said he
couldn't answer that.
A. I said it.
Q. I want to know
A. Listen, you know, that's the way it

- Q. I'm not asking you the way it worked.
- A. No, I can't answer it.
- Q. I'm not asking you for standard practice, I'm not asking you for pattern of practice, I'm asking you whether there was any other source of information other than your P.C. file which Scientologists had concerning your drug sale history.

MR. FLYNN: He said he couldn't answer.

MR. BLUMENSON: He did not say that. There is a new question, this is a new question.

A. The source, so that we don't have to get into -- you know, the exacerbation or the violation, I know what the intent is regarding the hoped for disintegration of Gerald Armstrong's psyche. But, everything prior to Scientology, everything in my life prior to Scientology, and a great deal in Scientology is in those thousand, fifteen hundred hours of auditing, virtually every detail of my life from the -- from my earliest recollection through time, up to

- Scientology, that's the pre-clear folder. It has every detail of my life.
- Q. Is your G.O. appllication part of your pre-clear folder?
- A. The G.O. application is based on data from the pre-clear folder.
- Q. It was filled out by somebody taking information out of the pre-clear folder and putting on the G.O. application?
 - A. Same data.
- Q. I'm not asking if it's the same data. Was the G.O. application filled out by a Scientologist going through your P.C. file?
 - A. I don't believe so.
- Q. It was filled out by you, correct? Can you answer that Gerry?
- A. Well, as much as I can -- you haven't produced it all, but that page -- you know, you're talking eleven years ago, and it seems likely that I would have typed up that thing for the application, it seems likely that it's me.
- Q. And, that's not what you would call a P.C. file, that G.O. application, correct?

9

2 issue.

3 MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not

4 asking you what the issue is Michael.

5 MR. FLYNN: Well, I'm

6 telling you what the issue is.

> No, I don't MR. BLUMENSON:

8 want to hear what your issues are.

MR. FLYNN: The issue is

10 that you construe P.C. file to mean

> confidential data given. The answer is yes.

It includes every bit of information given in

the

MR. BLUMENSON: You've made

your position clear.

16 Now, is the G.O. Application

17 considered an example of a P.C. file?

18 MR. FLYNN: By definition,

19 yes.

20 MR. BLUMENSON: This is an

21 I'm asking the witness, not you. outrage.

You did this in the Dede Reisdorf deposition, 22

23 you did this a million times in Matt's

> deposition. The courts have ruled that you

should not be answering	these	questions yourself
or obstructing depositi	ons on	numerous
occasions, Mr. Flynn.	You've	been warned so
many times, this record	is so	clear.
MR. F	LYNN:	Would you please
stop?		
A. Perhaps I can he	elp so	that you can
understand		

- Q. No, I want an answer to the question. This is a deposition, question and answer. My question is, is the G.O. application a part of the P.C. file?
- A. I would say that no, it properly belongs in what was called the ethics file.
- Q. Now, I'm going to ask you whether you said to the G.O. or you told the G.O. on your application that you had a history of drug sale prior to coming to Scientology?
- A. What I put on the application has no -- you know, it was obtained the same way. Your client represents that --
- Q. Just asked you whether you did. I'm not asking you how it was obtained. I'm asking you, did you tell the G.O. in your

- application for employment that you had sold drugs prior to 1969?
- A. I had filled out an application, I do not have it here, and we've already discussed this subject. And, regardless just think about it, regardless, even in ethics file you guys represent that the ethics files are confidential.
 - Q. Where does that appear?
- A. I have a statement from one of your attorneys.
- Q. When were you first told the ethics files were confidential?
 - A. When I first got into Scientology.
 - O. Who told you that?
- A. Well, it's within the literature, virtually everyone that I ever talked to on the subject of confidentiality and trust gave me the words and the impression that everything that you say, write, whatever, when you're here will never be used against you and that it's given in absolute trust, after all your trust has been violated so many times in the past.

Q.

	MR. FLYNN: Mr. Blumenson, I
	would call on you to use your common sense.
	Do you think that the type of information that
	you have been spewing forth is the type of
	thing that people commonly go around telling
	every Tom, Dick and Harry that they know?
	MR. BLUMENSON: Let's not
	have unnecessary colloquy, okay?
	MR. FLYNN: What it kind of
	conveys
	MR. BLUMENSON: I don't want
	a lecture from you
	MR. FLYNN: is the
	absurdity of this whole line of questioning.
	MR. BLUMENSON: I don't want
	a lecture from you, I just want to ask
	questions and get answers.
	MR. FLYNN: The proof is in
	the pudding.
	Q. Did you ever invoke a committee of
	evidence on some grievance you had?
	A. You'd have to refresh my memory.
-	Invoke a committee of evidence

Did you ever seek to have a committee

2

3

4

5

6

7

of evidence rule on something involving you?

- A. Are you talking about a review com. ev.?
- Q. Let's say review com. ev., did you ever invoke a review com. ev.?
 - A. I requested one.
- Q. Did you go through a committee of evidence?
 - A. Review com. ev.

(Discussion held off the record.)

Q. You complained in your Complaint
paragraph 24, Mr. Armstrong -- Can I have
some quiet in the room so I can ask questions?
-- Of your complaint, Mr. Armstrong, you say
that the cross-defendants intentionally,
oppressively and maliciously disclosed to
third persons confidential information
disclosed by cross-complaintant during
auditing, do you recall that?

A. Yes.

MR. FLYNN: Pleadings are

not evidence. So what?

MR. BLUMENSON: Can you

	restrain yourself so I can ask another
	question?
	MR. FLYNN: Yes, but what
	difference does it make?
	MR. BLUMENSON: This isn't a
	stage Mike, can you restrain yourself?
	MR. FLYNN: Pleadings are
2 2	not evidence
	Q. Do you claim that your drug sale
	history was one of these facts encompassed by
	this paragraph 24 that was obtained from the
	pre-clear files, and disclosed to third
	persons?
	MR. FLYNN: Been asked and
	answered.
	MR. BLUMENSON: It has not.
	MR. FLYNN: Everything in
	the P.C. files, everything that was disclosed
	in confidentiality within the Church.
	Q. Who was given
	MR. FLYNN: The basis of our
	Complaint is you have the pre-sleer files so

Complaint is, you have the pre-clear files, so

Do you have any knowledge of

you can just go and look.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- particular information that was given to a third person from your auditing files?
 - A. I have specific knowledge, yes.
- Q. And, who was the first person given any information from your auditing file?
- A. Guardian's office, the attorneys working for the organization, the office of special affairs.
 - Q. I asked who was the first person.
 - A. Well, as far as I know the G.O.
- Q. Who in the G.O. was given information from your auditing file?
 - A. Molly Alverzo.
 - Q. That was in 1975?
 - A. 1977.
 - Q. And, did you speak to Molly Alverzo --
- A. Listen here, no, the G.O. had my files in '76 when I was locked up, for the three weeks I was locked up in Fifield Manor. The G.O. told me then, so that was Ann Snyder, she was the one that told me. But, the violation started at day one, right from the beginning there were people who had the power to do it,

and actually did have their grubby little

hand	S	0	n	G	er	a.	10		Aı	c m	S	tı	0	n	g	1 5	5	p	r	e-	- C	1	e a	ar		f)1	de	r	
from	Ċ	la	У	0	ne	•		F	r	o m		d a	a y		0	n e	9 /		M	aı	: У	,	S	u e	è					
Hubb	ar	d	1 5	5	or	d	er	,	,	yο	u]	۲n	0	W	,	G	3 0	0	•	1	2	1 (66	9	(or			
what	eï	7 e	r	i	t	ĭ	S	е	Х.	is	t	e	É	p	r	i	or		t	0	n	У	(g e	t	t	i n	g		
invo	1 7	7 e	d	i	n	S	сi	е	ni	to	1	0 9	3 У	,		f:	ig	u	r	е	t	h	a t	t	0	ne	9	οu	t.	•
so,	у€	e s	,	t	h a	t	C	r	g	a n	i	Z	a t	i	0	n	N	/i	t	h	i	t	S	t	e	n	t a	cl	e	5,
and	th	ne	g	u	У	u	р	a	t	t	h	е	t	0	p	Ţ	v i	t	h	ł	ηi	S	1	te	n	ta	a C	le	S	
had	th	n e	ir		h a	n	d s	3	01	1	m	У	p	r	9	- (: 1	. е	a	r	f	0	1	d e	r	S	P	on	I	n y
thou	gh	nt	S,		an	d	U	S	е	Ë	t	h e	e m		t	0	C	0	n	tr	0	1	3	ne	2	fı	0	m	da	э у
one.																														

- Q. And, you found out, first found out that your auditing files were being looked at by unauthorized third persons in 1975?
- A. Again, well -- unauthorized by whom? The organization authorizes everybody to look at the damn thing. Unauthorized by me yes, unauthorized from day one. L. Ron Hubbard is unauthorized, the whole organization is unauthorized.
- Q. When was the first time that you found out that auditing files were not confidential?
- A. I guess the real hint was when I was in the G.O., you know, I may have heard little snippets here and there, because, you know,

- you kind of hear things around. But, when it -the first real inkling was in the G.O. when I
 saw telex traffic going back and forth with
 people's sexual problems, and that sort of
 thing.
 - Q. What year was that?
 - A. 1975.
- Q. Did your auditing file get conveyed to any newspapers?
- A. I'll have to think about that. You guys have not produced all of the press releases. But, I would say yes, Freedom, absolutely, yes, Church of Scientology California, Guardians Operation, yes, you got it all.
- Q. Was information from your P.C. files published by any newspapers, magazine, or any other media?
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. You don't know of any such case?
- A. No. In fact, that's one of my concerns, is that I'm looking forward to the day when I see it in glowing print.
 - Q. Were you told that unless you did

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

something	, (or d	idn	't	do so	methin	g that	the
contents	of	you	r a	udi	ting	files	would b	е
published	?							

- A. Well, utilized against me, I don't know what that means.
 - Q. Who told you that?
 - A. Let me read it.
- Q. All right, let me rephrase the question.
- A. No, let me answer that first just so I answer that question.
- Q. If you're going to point to the objection of July third, what I want to ask -- the objection speaks for itself. Prior to July 3, 1986, did anyone ever tell you that you must do or not do something or your auditing files would be released to non-Scientologists?
- A. I don't think it was -- let me put this on the record --
 - O. It's on the record.
 - A. No, it isn't on the record --

MR. FLYNN: Let him answer, be a little professional, then you can move to strike or do whatever lawyers do. But, don't

engage	in	a	ramb	lina	colloquy.
	ale & A	5.00	W /W 151 IV		oorroad ale

contents of these files a part of this case --MR. FLYNN: May the record reflect that Mr. Blumenson has given a demonstrable gesture to his opposing counsel in the way of a clenched fist with the middle finger

If Armstrong insists on making the

MR. BLUMENSON: Clenched

fist

MR. FLYNN: Did you do such

a thing?

MR. BLUMENSON: I did not

use a clenched fist.

MR. FLYNN: With the middle

finger above the clenched fist. Did you do

such a thing?

MR. BLUMENSON: Are you

referring to when I scratched my ear a minute

ago?

24

FLYNN: MR. Thank you for

the admission Mr. Blumenson.

A. The language at this point 450 SHA

That language

A .	No,	no	eme voice
63 0	INC	110	distr. com

- Q. If you want to introduce that as an exhibit, let's introduce it as an exhibit.
- A. Okay. Then you asked me about acts of threat by that organization regarding the utilization of pre-clear folders. I'll give it to you right now. If Armstrong insists on making the contents of these files a part of this case by obtaining copies of them, if he even looks at them. The last part, he even looks at them --
- Q. I'm withdrawing the question. There is no question on the floor, and I don't want to waste unnecessary time.

My new question is, other than that objection which was filed in court, were you ever threatened with the release of your pre-clear files to the media, or to any other organization unless you did or did not do something?

MR. BLUMENSON: Please stop laughing, Mike.

MR. FLYNN: I can't help it.

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Tell me the first such instance? 0. Well, it began, I guess the threat began the moment I decided to walk out the door of Scientology. Who made the threat? It is implicit in what I know of the organization. 0. Did anyone tell you that your auditing files would be used against you prior to July 3, 1986, at that pleading filed in court? MR. FLYNN: L. Ron Hubbard said it in the Fair Game Doctrine. MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not asking you for the answer Mr. Flynn, you're totally out of turn. MR. FLYNN: He said it in the Fair Game Doctrine, that's what the case is all about. Do you wish to adopt your counsel's answer?
- A. Well, I will adopt it as a base for perhaps the more comprehensive answer which I can give.
 - Q. Now, I'd like you to tell me in your

- you kind of hear things around. But, when it -the first real inkling was in the G.O. when I
 saw telex traffic going back and forth with
 people's sexual problems, and that sort of
 thing.
 - Q. What year was that?
 - A. 1975.
- Q. Did your auditing file get conveyed to any newspapers?
- A. I'll have to think about that. You guys have not produced all of the press releases. But, I would say yes, Freedom, absolutely, yes, Church of Scientology California, Guardians Operation, yes, you got it all.
- Q. Was information from your P.C. files published by any newspapers, magazine, or any other media?
 - A. I don't know.
 - Q. You don't know of any such case?
- A. No. In fact, that's one of my concerns, is that I'm looking forward to the day when I see it in glowing print.
 - Q. Were you told that unless you did

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- something, or didn't do something that the contents of your auditing files would be published?
- A. Well, utilized against me, I don't know what that means.
 - Q. Who told you that?
 - A. Let me read it.
- Q. All right, let me rephrase the question.
- A. No, let me answer that first just so I answer that question.
- Q. If you're going to point to the objection of July third, what I want to ask -- the objection speaks for itself. Prior to July 3, 1986, did anyone ever tell you that you must do or not do something or your auditing files would be released to non-Scientologists?
- A. I don't think it was -- let me put this on the record --
 - Q. It's on the record.
 - A. No, it isn't on the record --

MR. FLYNN: Let him answer, be a little professional, then you can move to strike or do whatever lawyers do. But, don't

A .	No.	no	4000 - 10000

- Q. If you want to introduce that as an exhibit, let's introduce it as an exhibit.
- A. Okay. Then you asked me about acts of threat by that organization regarding the utilization of pre-clear folders. I'll give it to you right now. If Armstrong insists on making the contents of these files a part of this case by obtaining copies of them, if he even looks at them. The last part, he even looks at them --
- Q. I'm withdrawing the question. There is no question on the floor, and I don't want to waste unnecessary time.

My new question is, other than that objection which was filed in court, were you ever threatened with the release of your pre-clear files to the media, or to any other organization unless you did or did not do something?

MR. BLUMENSON: Please stop

laughing, Mike.

MR. FLYNN: I can't help it.

A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

can give.

0.

Tell me the first such instance? 0. Well, it began, I quess the threat A. began the moment I decided to walk out the door of Scientology. 0. Who made the threat? It is implicit in what I know of the organization. 0. Did anyone tell you that your auditing files would be used against you prior to July 3, 1986, at that pleading filed in court? MR. FLYNN: L. Ron Hubbard said it in the Fair Game Doctrine. MR. BLUMENSON: I'm not asking you for the answer Mr. Flynn, you're totally out of turn. MR. FLYNN: He said it in the Fair Game Doctrine, that's what the case is all about. Do you wish to adopt your counsel's answer? Well, I will adopt it as a base for A.

Now, I'd like you to tell me in your

perhaps the more comprehensive answer which I

own	WO	rds	,	an	d	I ,	d	1	i	k	е	M	r.	F	1	У	nn	t	0	re	S	tr	ai	n
hims	el	f,	I	WO	ul	d	1:	i k	е		to		knc	W		W	ho	i	f	an	У	00	dу	*
thre	at	ene	d	уо	u	wi	tl	1	r	е	le	a	se	0	f		yо	ur	ć	aud	i	ti	ng	
file	S	if	уо	u	di	d	n	ot		d	0	S	o m e	t	h	i	ng	C	r	di	d	d	0	
some	th	ing	?																					

A. The organizational policy, the organizational structure, the hierarchy, L. Ron Hubbard, through my knowledge of their past acts and through the documentation which I acquired existed as a real threat. And, I understood their possession of those documents to be a real threat, and I knew as abhorrent as it was, and unconfrontable as it was, I suspected and kind of hoped in my heart of hearts that it wouldn't happen, but I suspected that sooner or later I would see something like this document. And, there it is.

- Q. And, that document is referring to the July 3, 1986 document is the first time that you know of auditing, what you believe is auditing information being disclosed?
 - A. No.
 - O. When, what is the first time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. When was the first time that you saw a declare?
 - A. On the ship.
- Q. At that time you knew that an S.P. declare -- if an S.P. declare is issued that there is an opportunity to request a committee of evidence; does the person who is declared have an opportunity to request a committee of evidence?
 - A. I suppose that depends on the person.
- Q. Did you request a committee of evidence when you were declared?
 - A. No.
 - O. Are S.P. declares culled?
 - A. Define that.
- Q. Well, do they have to be reviewed by somebody else than the author?
- A. Well, mine was reviewed by John Peterson.
- Q. Well, is the the policy of Scientology that declares have been to be looked at by more than one person before they're issued?
- A. No, L. Ron Hubbard's stuff was never looked at other than by the typist, so I guess

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the	typi	st	SIGNA MANA	SO	the	answ	er to	the q	uestion
is	yes,	unle	ss	it	s or	ne th	at he	typed	himself

- And, in Scientology ideology or doctrine, an S.P. declare is charges which may or may not be refuted in a committee of evidence, is that correct?
- An S.P. declare is the No. declaration of someone as a suppressive person. It may or may not contain charges, but those are incidental to the fact that the person has been declared a suppressive person relative to Scientology.
- What is the doctrinal reason for having an S.P. declare as you learned when you were on the boat?
- A. Well, what L. Ron Hubbard says is that's the epods aprilla I think he said something like, that's the most humanitarian thing to do. think that the person can never come to his senses if you don't declare them.

In fact, what a declare is -- see there is a Scientological concept called: wrong item. If you indicate a wrong item to someone, right, the person will, if

it's a wrong item, dramatize the item. If
it's a right item, the person will cease to
dramatize that item. So, figure out they
call me a suppressive person, I get that
indication, that's a declaration, Gerald
Armstrong is a suppressive person. Thereafter
I didn't become, in their eyes, not a
suppressive person. I continued to dramatize
it. So, by definition, by the Hubbardian tech,
I could not have been a suppressive person.
So, it's in error.
Q. You say that when you learned on the
ship, was that
MR. BLUMENSON: What was
that, Mike?
MR. FLYNN: That was a quick
analysis of Hubbardian psychology, which kind
of has that theme.
MR. BLUMENSON: Can you keep
your analysis to yourself?
MR. FLYNN: I was just
opening my eyes to it.
Q. When you were on the ship, you were

told that S.P. declares were for humanitarian

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

purposes?

- A. Right.
- Q. And, did you believe that?
- God, I don't even know it's real rough to question anything like that. that's you're into that area which is real important in understanding the control mechanism for why someone would after seeing one of these scurrilous documents stay in. And, the reason is because they are so scurrilous, the picture that is painted of anyone who is declared a suppressive person, is of some awful individual. So, someone else seeing that document knows that, I'm not committing crimes like that, I don't think like that, I'm not that kind of a person. he never thinks that that could apply to him. Only when it happens to you do you realize, of course, that's how they kept them all in. mean, that's why I continued, why I'd see a suppressive person declared, but I'm given the black P.R. campaign about how evil this guy is, destructive of mankind, I mean that's the picture that you are given in the S.P. declare.

1.0

- Q. So, the theory is --
- A. The theory is if you black P.R. the guy enough, no one can perceive -- I mean when you're inside Scientology you can never perceive of yourself as doing something destructive, to hurt the organization, to harm L. Ron Hubbard, any of those things. So, you cannot perceive that these things are going to happen to you. It's the same explanation for the culling in 1975.
 - Q. I'm not asking you about the culling --
 - A. That explains it.
- Q. Yes, but let's try to limit to a responsive answer. I'm not asking you about culling now.

MR. FLYNN: Gerry, you finish your answer and he can move to strike. Go ahead and testify.

MR. BLUMENSON: Mike you want to prolong this so unnecessarily, I didn't have a single question here, this question didn't concern culling, this question concerned an S.P. declare. And, if you want to prolong this deposition by, you know,

insis	ting	th	at	some	th	ing	abou	t	cull	in	g c	ome	in,
you k	now	we '	re	goin	g	to	have	to	be	he	re	for	
ages	in t	he	fut	ure	wi	th	that	ki	nd o	f	con	duct	•

MR. FLYNN: Would you let

him answer, please?

MR. BLUMENSON: If you insist, go ahead. I will move to strike. But, we're wasting time. It's obvious it's not relevant to my question.

- A. It's very relevant to the case.
- Q. Yes, but my question is not about culling.
- A. It's relevant to the question, because it has to do with that exact item, that declare, and that -- the technique the black P.R. technique which is run.
 - Q. I just asked you whether you believe --
- A. 1975, I get an inkling of what's being done, what's being done in the context of suppressive persons. I know that I'm not suppressive. How can I possibly be? I'm dedicated, I worked day and night, I slaved for this guy, I don't deviate from that path at all.

Q.	What	is	a	suppressive	person	in
Scientol	Logy?					

- A. A suppressive person is someone so labeled by L. Ron Hubbard.
- Q. What does the ideology say a suppressive person is, or what does the doctrine say a suppressive person is?
- A. Well, the doctrine said a suppressive person is one of the two and a half percent most evil persons on the planet, a psychotic, truly insane, there's probably a number of definitions.
- Q. A definition of a suppresive person is someone who will harm Scientology?
 - A. That's probably one of them.
 - Q. Were you taught that definition?
- A. I was probably taught the whole -you can't understand. As soon as you say the
 word suppressive person that alters every
 perception about that guy, because suppressive
 person doctrine is the basis of Scientology,
 Hubbard based the whole thing on that.
- Q. You mean that Scientology could not exist without differentiating between people

who	would	harm	Sciento	ology	or	people	who	would
help	Scier	ntolog	l A S					

- A. Well, let's put it this way,

 Scientology as we know it without the fair

 game cum suppressive person, so --
- Q. My question was, does existence in Scientology ideology depend on distinguishing between suppressive persons who will harm Scientology, and others who will help Scientology?
- A. Well, you're into the definition of Scientology.
- Q. Well, you said that all of Scientology depends on suppressive person declares. I want to know what that means.
- A. What it means is that when someone up at the top of the organization doesn't like someone down at the bottom of the organization, they declare them a suppressive person and gets rid of them, that's what it is.
- Q. Do you know who declared you a suppressive person?
- A. Well I suppose -- I mean the order came from Terry Gamboa. In fact the grand

order comes from L. Ron what's his name.

- Q. Well, the order to name you as a suppressive person came from Terry Gamboa?
- A. Well, Terry ordered -- and the only information that I have on that is on admission by you people within the B-l file.

 That's the way it went. Okay, so I know that.

 That's the one fact that I have.

Your organization has failed to produce all of these documents despite orders, relating to the suppressive person declare, you've failed to produce those documents, so all I have is that. The initial order came from L. Ron Hubbard.

- Q. What, the initial order to have S.P. declares generally?
- A. Well, if you take it back
 philosophically, the creation of the
 suppressive person idea, the creation of fair
 game, the creation of the concept of enemies,
 the creation of the operations, the creation
 of the destruction, the creation of the policy
 to ruin people utterly, borrowed from L. Ron
 Hubbard, that's all from Hubbard.

Q.	I	8	m	a	S	k.	i	n	g		a	b	0	u	t			wjeso	elliste				
										(I	n	t	e	r	r	u	p	t	i	0	n)

- Q. Do you believe that L. Ron Hubbard himself, individually ordered you to be named as a suppressive person, or did the order that you in particular be named come from somebody else?
- A. Well, the specific order that I know came at least from Terry. Terry of course is the surrogate, if you want to call it, the quasi, you know, the L. Ron Hubbard. So, you know, they're acting by policy, you know the messengers act for Hubbard. So, we've that link.
 - Q. Terry Gamboa is your former wife?
- A. Yes.
 - Q. Is an S.P. declare supposed to warn Scientologis s to stay away from the S.P., is that one of it's functions?
 - A. Yes, one of it's functions.
 - Q. And, is the ideology that the rank and file understand that this person is going to be harmful to the Church?
 - A. I hesitate to get into what the rank

3	pin		74			- 19							229		
and	I	1	1	0	un	a	0	r	S	t	a	n	a	S	

- Q. But, when you were in --
- A. I'll give you what the understanding is. The rank and file seeing that document understand that Gerald Armstrong is evil beyond belief, and that it therefore is totally acceptable behavior to, yes, cut off all communications with him, but more than that, do what thou wilt.

MR. FLYNN: Off the record.

(Discussion held off the record.)

- Q. So, an S.P. declare warns people who are in the Church, warns Scientologists that the S.P. is a threat to the Church?
- A. I don't know if only construed like that. It certainly brings up hatred towards the individuals. So, I guess you can't have hatred without threat, right? So, I guess, yes, sure, those people are viewed as threats and hated, yes.
- Q. When you were on the ship, did you believe that people who were declared were threats to the existence of the Church?

	Α.	Did	I b	e1	ie	ve	especia. Ann
--	----	-----	-----	----	----	----	--------------

Q. Did you think that they were threats to the Church?

MR. FLYNN: If you can remember what you thought at the time, right? That's your question, what he thought at that point in time?

MR. BLUMENSON: Uh huh.

A. Well, my guess right now is upon seeing these things I would have felt like there was a threat which has now been caught, and there is no way we can be threatened because we're the only hope mankind has, and we're incredibly dedicated.

Q. You mean by the acts of declaring the person, S.P., that threat is removed?

A. Well, I think, you know, that's part of the -- I mean, clearly it's an instrument to create hatred toward the individual. The form that that takes in the persons mind, in my mind I suppose, it always seemed like this was a tremendous kind of revelation. Like we've now found the reason why it's been so difficult all of this time. Each time there

would be a new, you know, this week it's Ott	.0
Roos, and we got rid of the S.G's and, it's	
just going to be wonderful. It's Wayne	
Elkhart, it's Rudy Savage, it's this guy, it	. ' S
that guy. They come and they go. They're	
declared suppressives, and the situation	
doesn't change.	

- Q. Is an S.P. declare a way that the absence of someone is explained to the people who remained? I mean, I'm asking -- I'm asking based on what you said.
 - A. The absence o someone?
- Q. When someone disappears, is an S.P. declare, is one of the purposes of S.P. declare to explain why he is gone to the people who remain?

MR. FLYNN: You mean to explain why things have gone wrong?

- Q. To explain why the person is no longer there.
- A. Well, I suppose that, you know, those that I've seen have been probably connected to the individual. So, I knew faces. But, I don't know that -- you know, the suppressive

person declares, if that was true, then
suppressive person declares would be isolated
down to the immediate area. You know, why is
Joe missing today. Oh, here's the explanation.
That would make sense.
But, if Joe is in Los

Angeles, and the suppressive person declare goes to every continent internationally, it's hardly to explain why Joe isn't there.

- Q. Who is a suppressive person declare -let's put it this way, who saw this
 suppressive person declare about you, to your
 knowledge?
- A. Well, I know that it was disseminated -
 MR. FLYNN: Which one, the

 first one or the second one?

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MR.}}$$ BLUMENSON: Either of them, both of them.

- A. I know that it was disseminated within the Los Angeles Organization and the Clearwater Organization, and I'm not totally sure, but I believe it definitely -- or I believe it showed up in the U.K.
 - Q. In a Church?

Α.,	Some	where	οv	er	there	,	you	know,	it's
quite	endo atolia								
Ω.	You	mean	in	an	org.	or	a n	nission	or a
Church	or so	mewhe	re	els	e?				

- A. As far as I know the dissemination of it was acheived by the organization, to it's own parishioners, to it's own membership, to whatever they call them, to those people that have to be convinced.
- Q. To those people who have to be convinced of what?
 - A. That Armstrong is evil.
- Q. And, why does the organization feel that it has to convince people that Armstrong is evil?
 - A. Because of what he knows.

MR. FLYNN: About Ron.

- Q. About what?
- A. About L. Ron Hubbard, about the organization's intent, about the activities of the organization, about the violations of pre-clear folders, of twelve and a half years of perception, and realization, and documentation of the fraud of L. Ron Hubbard

Scientology.
Q. So, when you say that an S.P. declare
is a way of eliminating a threat to the Church,
in your particular case would you say the S.P.
declare was the tool by which the things you
said would not be believed by the Church
membership, the things that you said about
Hubbard and the Church would not be believed?
A. Correct. That was certainly a part of
it, was to undermine those facts which I uncovered.
Q. And, the Church saw what you had as a
threat to, in fact, to their very survival,
isn't that true?
MR. FLYNN: You mean L. Ron
Hubbard's credibility? What do you mean by
very survival?
MR. BLUMENSON: To the
survival of the Church?
A. I can answer that.
MR. FLYNN: I object because
I don't know what survival of the Church means.
MR. GELLER: It's not

important, it's important that he does.

Go ahead Gerry.

	Α.		W	h	e	n	7	/ C	u		water	ot selec		У	0	u	k	n	0	W	/	1	. e	t	8	S	1	C	a l	. 1		it	
the	or	g a	a n	i	Z	a i	t i	i c	n	7	C	r		1	е	t	1 5	5	C	a	1	1	i	t		S	C	i	er	ıt	0	10	9 у
but	wh	e r	1	W	е	8 3	r e	è	t	a J	l. k	ζi	n	g		ak	00	u	t		t	h a	t		a	n	d	1	wt	10	n		
we'r	е	ta	al	k	i	n	3	â	b	01	ıt		t	h	0	S	9	a	C	t	S	W	h	i	С	h		h	a v	7 e		b e	en
take	n	aç	ga	í	n	S	t	G	e	ra	a 1	d.		A	r	m a	st	r	0	n	g	,	W	е	8	r	е		t a	1	k	in	g
abou	t	tl	ne		S	m a	a J	1		g 1	: c	u	p		0	r	t	: h	е		i	n ö	li	V	i	d	u	a.	1	W	h	0	
cont	ro	1 8	3	S	C	i (e r	ı t	0	10	9	У	,		al	n c	t	W	h	0	(са	1	1	S		a.	1.	l	t	h	е	
shot	s.		T	h	a	t	j	n	d	i	7 i	. d	u	a	1	,	t	. h	a	t		li	t	t	1	е	1	рф	N C	1 e	r		
grou	р	Wá	3.8		W	ha	a t	e ar	W	as	5	t	h	r	e a	a. 1	t e	n	е	d	/	n	0		0	t	h	e 1	r				
indi	νi	ďι	ıa	1	,	Wé	as	3	t	hı	: 6	a	t	e	n	e	f	i	n		a I	n y	7	W	a	У	•		T	h:	0	se	
peop	le	Ţ	v h	0		ha	a c	1	S	uŗ	r	е	m	e		pq	N C	<i>i</i> e	r	,		a n	d		W	h	0		h a	ıd		t h	е
atte	nd	aı	nt		S	u	ρı	: ∈	m	е	F	a	r	a	n	0:	i a	ì	W	е	r	9	С	0	n	V	i	n (C €	d:	*	t h	at
they	W	er	c e		t	hı	c e	e a	t	er	ı e	e d	60																				

Q. And, that's why the S.P. declare came out?

MR. FLYNN: That's why the policy exists.

- Q. But, in your case, I just want to narrow it to your case, that's why they declared you an S.P. because you were a threat to their survival, the inner circle survival?
- A. Well, that's certainly a part of it.

 It existed as a tool, it was a black P.R.

 vehicle. It could upset Armstrong, it could

cut all of his communication lines. It was
just a part of the whole black propaganda,
operation Armstrong, operation destroy
Armstrong. It was just a piece of it.
Q. Because Armstrong was the most
significant threat that the Church faced at
that time?
MR. FLYNN: You mean in the
context of his prior answer?
Q. Yes. Did they view you as the most
significant threat?
MR. FLYNN: They being L.
Ron Hubbard and his immediate
MR. BLUMENSON: Yes.
A. Well, when you say immediate
MR. GELLER: He said
immediate.
MR. FLYNN: I said immediate,
meaning his power clique. He said immediate.
Q. Do you think that you were declared
because the people who declared you viewed the
dissemination of what you knew as a major
threat to their survival?

When we're talking about survival,

we're	talkin	g about	survival	of fraudulent
money	making	income	power app	aratus, that's
what	was thr	eatened,	or what	they conceived
was t	threaten	ed. Non	e of thes	e individuals
gille stem	I mean	look at	Gerald Ar	mstrong, does
this	guy thre	eaten an	yone? I	mean I

- Q. What you term the power, and the manipulation, and greed, and all that that you see in the inner circle?
 - A. I threatened that.
- Q. But, to put it in a more neutral term, you threatened the division of authority within the Church?
 - A. Division?
- Q. The division of authority, the power structure of the Church?
- A. Well, you know, it's difficult for me to give the specifics of what was in the mind of those individuals.
- MR. FLYNN: Will Rogers said you can't threaten an honest man.
 - Q. Keep going.
- A. So, knowing the policies and practices of the organization for so many years, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

	knowing the individual somewhat intimately on
	top of it, that is L. Ron Hubbard, yes, he
	viewed me as a serious threat.
-	Q. And, you were a threat to the belief
-	that L. Ron Hubbard was a super enlightened

- A. Well I was -- I mean it's not that simple -- what I was a threat to was the myth of L. Ron Hubbard, and the utilization of that myth to control and obtain great wealth and power from the people to whom the myth is is being promulgated, I threatened that.
- Q. Did you reveal the S.P. declare to any persons?
 - A. Yes.

individual, correct?

- Q. And, who did you tell that to?
- A. I told Joslyn, my friends, the press,
 a lot of people.
 - Q. Would you say it was over 20?
 - A. Yes.
 - O. Over 50?
 - A. I don't know. It may have been. I testified about it in court, there is 50 people in court, there's been umpteen

1	depositions in dozens of cases. It's come up
2	time and time again. Yes, I have no problem
3	with telling everyone that that litany of bullshit
4	is the suppressive person declare.
5	MR. FLYNN: That's your
6	safety.
7	MR. BLUMENSON: Please Mr.
8	Flynn, you've done this consistently
9	A. He was not feeding me answers, he has
10	never fed me answers.
11	MR. FLYNN: Listen, it was a
12	philosophical review, it really was.
13	Q. Did you ever hand out copies of the
14	S.P. declare on you to any of the press or any
15	others?
16	A. I don't recall if I did or not.
17	Q. You may have?
18	A. May have.
19	Q. Did you read sections of it to the
20	press?
21	A. Well, if they were there, I probably
22	gave them the document. You know, to me, at

the time, 1982, this is a heavy document.

course it's rather light in terms of what's

- gone down since, but at that time it was a mind blower.
- Q. When you were in the Church, did you believe S.P. declares, and committees of evidence were a valid way to deal with disloyal Church members?
- A. I don't believe that I ever gave it any thought, there was no other way.
- Q. Okay. And, during the final days that you were in the Church -- during the final days that you were in the Church, did you know that people were disenchanted with you, or worried about you?
 - A. Disenchanted?
 - O. Or worried?
- A. Worried about me? I have difficulty thinking that very few people worry about anyone else. In there, that's a whole -- that's an idea that's on the outside.
- Q. Did you know that there were people in the Church who thought that you were a threat to the Church during your final days at the Church?
 - A. Well, I knew that Norman Starkey and

that lit	ttle group	at the	top, S	tarkey	
certainl	ly ordered	me sec.	check	ed, and	all I'm
doing is	s my job.	And, hi	s conc	ern was	that I
was givi	ing the tru	ith to O	mar Ga	rrison.	so,
that cer	ctainly	- I mea	n, tha	t was a	mind
bending	incident a	as well.			

- Q. Did you have some doubt about what they were accusing you of prior to the S.P. declare?
- A. Doubt what they were accusing me of? That makes no sense.
- Q. Well, did you think there was any kind of whispering campaign?
 - A. A whispering campaign?

MR. FLYNN: This is what the whole other case was about, this correspondence back and forth. There's hours of testimony, Mr. Blumenson. This is all a rehash.

- A. A whispering campaign?
- Q. Yes. Let me put it this way. Did you ever ask them to come right out and tell you, make accusations against you?
 - A. Well, I offered for Norman to come and

talk	to	me,	but	Nor	nan	decli	ined	/	and	I	did	not
stick	c a:	round	d be	vond	а	point	of	ho	pele	258	sness	5.

- Q. Is there ideology in Scientology that before any other actions can be taken like in a secular court there has to be an S.P. declare?
 - A. What?
 - Q. Is there any such doctrine?
- A. What?
 - Q. That the first step in the justice system would be an S.P. declare?
 - A. Before a step can be taken in the legal arena, so like you guys have got a case against the F.B.I. so --
 - Q. Let's say a case against the Church of Scientology?
 - A. Okay, and then the case against -No, I can't say that is always the case. I
 don't know. Allerd, who else have they
 brought suit against? Do you mean that the
 S.P. declare was the tip off that I should
 have recognized that now they're going to
 legitimize the lawsuit?
 - Q. I don't know the answer to the

	1	question. I'm just asking.
	2	When you asked to set up the
	3	biography project
	4	A. Right.
	5	Q. Who were you then and, your
	6	request was accepted, correct?
	7	A. Correct.
	8	Q. And, who were you then employed by?
	9	MR. FLYNN: That's the whole
<u> </u>	10	other case, L. Ron Hubbard, that's what the
2	11	opinion says
DEPOSITIONS (State 1 each at	12	MR. BLUMENSON: I don't want
o li leo	13	you to answer.
DE	14	MR. FLYNN: This is outside
	15	of the outline. The outline is supposed to
	16	exclude prior cases I understand, that's what
	17	the entire case is about.
	18	MR. GELLER: You have a
	19	Complaint in this case in your counter claim
	20	for interference with contractural
Since 1971	21	relationship, right? So, how can Eric inquire
g Services	22	unless you let him go into this area?
ty Court Reporting Services Since 1971	23	MR. BLUMENSON: Are you
ty Cour	24	going to refuse that question to be answered?

																B.E	m			ע אבע	. 10	P 3.7	n.T			r	1 -	7	تہ		~ ~				_			
																										T.												
S	e	C	OI	10				Y	0	u	1	m	e a	an	Ł	f	0	r		bı	c e	a	C	h	3		N	0	W	,	ŧ	: t	n e		p	ar	t	
0	f		a.	11	. е	g	a	t	i	0	n		٠	epo epite			t	h	е	June of the last o	o a	r	t		0	f	C	0	m	p.	lá	a i	i n	t		tł	na	t
W	e	1	re	9	t	a.	1	k	i	n	g		ak	00	u	t			ujibila j	-																		
																М	R			ВІ	L U	M	E	N	S	01	1:		,	Y (οι	1	C	a	n			
S	t	11	d v	7	v	0	17	r		C	0	m	n i	a	i	n	t		1	a 1	- 6	· Pr			1	M á	a k	6		V i	7 1	1 1						
													E	to No	h seller		-		etilin		Lp %	- 440	۰							χ.		~ ~						
0	D]	е (ct	. 1	0	n	•																														
																M	R	•		FI	Y	N	N	0		J		j	u	S	t	V	v a	n	t	t	0	
t	a	k	9	8	1	q	u	i	C	k		1	0 0) k		a	t		t	he	3	C	0	m	p	l a	ì	n	t	•								
																M	R	•		BI	U	M	E	N	S	ON			1	M	a k	: e	à	У	0	ur		
0	b	j	e	ct	: i	0	n																															
																M	R			FI	. Y	N	N			V	Jh	V		de	o r	, 8	t		V	οu	1	
		-				1	7		-																			_							_			
)	u	S	C	£	. е	7	1		I	6		ą.	u.	L C																						m e		
																M	R	۰		BI	JU	M	E	N	S	ON			1	M :	Y	Ç	<u>u</u>	9	S	ti	. 0	n
i	S	,	7	wh	10		W	е	r	е		У	C	1	е	m	p	1	0	у	e d		b	У		a i	t	е	r	1	Ϋ́) (ır		0	ff	Ē e	r
W	a	S	ć	a c	C	е	p	t	е	d		t	0	W	10	r	k		0	n	t	h	е		b	ic	g	r	a j	p l	n y	7	p	r	0	j∈	e C	t?
			1	A .			L	•		R	01	n	-	lu	ıb	b	a	r	đ	•																		
			ζ	2 .			A	n	d	,	1	W	e r	: e		У	0	u		pa	ai	d		b	У	I	l o		R	10	1	E	I u	b	b	ar	d	?
			,	. F			TAT	0	7	year	,	1	17]	1 1	i	m	a	+	0	1 ,	7.		v	9	2	•		B	13	t								
																				-			_								- 7							
			(2.			W	a	S		T.	n a	a t	6. 91	0	1	I	1	C	lć	1 6	. 1	У		У	OU	ır		eı	n	O 1	. C	У	е	r	2		
			À	A .			A	n		0	£	f	í	i	a	1		е	m	p.	Lo	У	е	r	?													
			(2.			Y	е	S	•			I	n	e	a	n	,	,	wł	10)	W	a	S	t	: h	е	J	ре	er	2	0	n	1	wh	10	
W	a	S	Ī	ра	у	i	n	g		У	0	u'	?		W	h	а	t	,	Wě	3 5	5	t	h	e	C	r	g	al	n:	i z	2 8	t	i	01	n		

that was directly paying you?

A. Well, Sea Org. Reserves, whatever that
is, it's L. Ron Hubbard's
Q. Did you consider yourself an employee
doing a job at that time?
A. Yes, you know, I guess so.
Q. And, were you employed did you
consider yourself an employee of a branch of
the Church of Scientology at the time.
MR. FLYNN: This is a
contract that he had with Hubbard.
MR. GELLER: Allegedly.
MR. FLYNN: That the Church
interfered with.
MR. BLUMENSON: Can I ask
some questions?
Q. Did you consider yourself employed by
the Church of Scientology in some fashion when
you were working on the biography project?
A. I used their facilities, but I was on
this Hubbard project.
Q. But, were you working on the Hubbard
project for the Church?
A. No. A differentiation was made

between so-called Church, and so-called

Scientology?

Hubbard staff. And, I was to be because
of the fact that I was making money directly
for L. Ron Hubbard, and working on his book, a
fact which the organization you will note
could not be involved you know, in this
C.S.C., C.S. whatever, to keep them, to give
the apparentness of distances between Hubbard
and the organization. I was to be Hubbard.
Q. Were you ever an employee of the
Scientologists as opposed to Hubbard?
A. You know, Hubbard is Scientology.
MR. FLYNN: Of the
Scientologists? What does that mean?
Q. Hubbard is Scientology?
MR. FLYNN: What does that
mean, of the Scientologists?
Q. Were you ever an employee of the
Church of Scientology?
A. Well, not in this sense that a person
is an employee of you know L. Ron Hubbard
ran it, he ran every detail. L. Ron Hubbard
Q. L. Ron Hubbard ran the Church of

If we can agree that the alter ego

]
is	su	е	h	a s	3	b	e e	n		li	t	íç	g a	t	ec	,	ĉ	an	d	L		R	on	F	lu	bt	oar	d:		
is																														
												M F	١.		FL	Y	NN	I :		Н	is	st	or	у						
		Α.	•	Г	h'	e	n	I	1 3	11		qι	ıi	t			Вι	ıt	,	t	h a	t	1 5	1	c h	е	Wâ	чУ		
it	W	a	S ,	L	1 .]	Ro	n	F	l u	b	b a	ar	đ	r	a	n	i	t,		I	W	or	ke	e d	1	or	: I		
Ro	n	Нι	dı	b a	r	d	•																							
		Q.	•	A	1	1	r	i	gh	nt	,	2	70	u	٤	a	У		reado conir											
											le constitue de la constitue d	M F	٠,		BL	U	M E	N 3	SO	N	:		Μi	k e	9 /	(con	ne		
on	•	Ĭ	E V	er	У	•	qu	e	st	· pool	01	n	I		a s	k	7	70	u	i	n t	e	rj	ec	: t	2	70 U	ır		
OW	n	o I	ρi	ni	.0	n	S	0	r	a	n	SV	<i>i</i> e	r	s,		i t	. 1	s	r	íć	ĺ	c u	10	ou	s.	•			
											thead	M F	. 5		FL	Y	NN			0	n 1	У	b	ec	ca	us	зе			
th	is	ł	na	S	a	1.	L	b	e e	e n		li	.t	i	g a	t	e ċ													
											1	MF	` .		BL	U	ME	IN.	SO	N	*		We	11	,	7	70 U	1		
ca	n	re	a i	se	•	У	o u	r	C	do	j	9.0	t	1	on	S	2	S i	m p	1	у,		j u	st		1 i	. ke	2		
th																										_				
Yo	u	do	n	t		h	a v	е	t	0	1	m a	k	е	9	t	a t	e	me	n	ts	5	a b	01	ıt	t	he	2		
an	SW	er		sh	0	u.	ld		be	ž																				
																					ri	C	/	WE	9	do	n'	t		
Wa	nt	1	0	r	e	1:	l t	1	g a	t																,				
						E			lo-	1							IVI E	i N	50	N	0		L '	m	a	Sk	in	ıg		
on	a	Ç	30	oa		Id	i l	C	Π	D							N7 N			т	27	نمرا	n 1	4	de	h å	yn 1-			
											£	1 1			ar La	J.	ra ra	0		J.	C	(U)	11	-	-	11 1	n k		0 0	

When you say if the alter ego is

resolved one way, fine, you were an employee

	0 1	E	S	c	i	е	n	t	0	1	0	g	У	,		i	f		i	t		i	SI	n	1 t		У	0	u	7	√ e	r	9		aı	n				
	еп	n g	01	0	У	е	е	(0	£		L	•		R	0	n	1	H	u	b	b	a:	r	d,		i	S		tl	n a	t		W	h	a t	-	уо	u	
	Sa	a i	Ld	,		i	S		t	h	a	t		W	h	a	t		У	0	u		m	e a	a n	t	?													
				A	8			I		d	0	n	9	t		u	n	đ	е	r	S	t	a	n	b	W	h	a	t		γc	u		S	a	i	d.			
				Q	٠			W	e	r	е		У	0	u		W	0	r	k	i	n	g	,	ć	lu	r	i	n	g	У	0	u	r		ti	i m	е		
	fı	c c	n	1	1	9	7	1		t	0		1	9	8	1	/		d	u	r	i	n	g	â	1	1		0	£	t	. h	a	t		ti	i m	ie	у	ט ט
	W	e r	e	:	a	n		eı	m	p	1	0	У	е	е		0	£		S	0	m	9	01	1 6	9	S	,		r:	i g	h	t	3						
				A	•			Y	0	u		k	n	0	W			uere .	-																					
																		M	R	•		F	L	Y	NN				T	h:	i s	,	i	S	1	W	na	t	tl	n e
	eı	n t	: i	.r	е				April 10 and 10			H	0	1	d		i	t	,		h	0	1	đ	j	. t	,		t	i I	ne		0	u	t			Mr	•	
	L	o r	19	ĺ	W	a	S		t	h	e	r	е	,		h	е		C	a:	n		t	e.	11		У	0	u	/	У	0	u		C	ar	1	ta	11	ζ
	to)	h	ì	m	/		0	r		У	0	u		C	a	n		g	0		r	e	a	d	t	h	е		tı	са	n	s	C	r	iŗ	ρt			
	Tl	n j	. 8	S	i	s		W	h	a	t		t	h	e		f	i	r	S	t		t	r:	i a	1		W	a	S	a	1	1		al	bo	วน	t.		
	A	5	I		u	n	đ	e:	r	S	t	a	n	d		i	t	,		i.	t	9	S		SU	ıp	g	0	s	e	E	t	0		b	е				
-	e	K C	:1	. u	d	e	d		f	r	0	m		t	h	е		d	е	p	0	S	i	t:	i c	n		t	е	s t	ti	. m	0	n	У	•				
																		M	R	•		В	L	U	M E	N	S	0	N	0		J	u	S	t	1	са	is	е	
	У) t	ır		0	b	j	e	С	t	i	0	n	1		a	n	đ		t	h	е	n	1	w e		1	1		1:	it	i	g	a	t	е	i	.t		
	w:	i t	: h	ì	t	h	e		j	u	đ	g	е	•																										
																		M.	R	•		F	L	Y	NN	0 0			W	е	r	е		d	e	pa	ar	ti	nç	3
	fı) II	ì	t	h	е	(0	u	t	1	i	n	е		a	S	,	W	е		h	a '	v e	•	t	h	r	0 1	ug	h	0	u	t	Γ	n o	st) f
	tl	1 6	2	d	a	У	•										,																							
																	1	M.	R	ø		В	Li	U	M E	N	S	0	N	0 0		N	0			100× 100	100			
!																																								

to waste your time in this way, Mr. Blumenson

MR. FLYNN: And, if you want

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is that?

It's almost 4:30.

you	only	have	one	minu	te	1 €	ft	to	day	
				MR.	BLU	ME	INSC	N:	W	h

I don't know if you were here, I told Mr. Geller that we have to adjourn at 4:30.

Q. I want to know the answer to -- you were the employee of someone from 1971 to 1981, right?

MR. FLYNN:

A. Well, I was, there were times when it was represented, and I was to represent that I was an employee of Operation and Transport Corporation, again, Hubbard owned O.T.C. so it's Hubbard. For certain other reasons I was the Church of Scientology staff, but, let me see, United Churchs until -- you know, I went through various of these things until I came on to the biography project. You see, I was already Hubbard's personal staff, it's not considered Church to use your term. differentiation was made even within the I was on what was called organization. it was in what was called the household unit, L. Ron Hubbard personal staff, working for Hubbard. I transferred from there over to the

impotent

personal public relations office of L. Ron	
Hubbard, likewise within what was known as the	
personal office, the personal staff of L. Ron	
Hubbard.	
 Q. Is that the L.R.H. personal office?	
A. Didn't I just say that?	
Q. That's what I'm asking you.	
MR. FLYNN: It's 4:30.	
MR. BLUMENSON: Wait.	
MR. FLYNN: Put this in your	
Mc Carthy file.	
MR. BLUMENSON: One thing	
we've got to do, which Mike Tabb promised that	
we would do today	
MR. FLYNN: What's that?	
MR. BLUMENSON: And that is,	
a stipulation as to whether impotence would be	
a damage in this case, or would be excluded	
from the case. I asked if it was going to be	
excluded, I didn't want to get into the issue,	
if it wasn't going to be excluded, I would	
have to get into it, obviously. He said that	
MR. FLYNN: Gerry, are you	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Α.	Well	. ,	you	know,	can	we	do	this	outside
of	the	ears	of	the	Court	Rep	port	ter?		

MR. BLUMENSON: We've got to have if on the record.

A. I can answer.

MR. FLYNN: This is the area we're going to let you go into. Go ahead.

I have within the Complaint nothing to do with the loss of consortium. Okay. However, regarding the Nothing about that. situation which was created with my wife by the operations of the organization, that resulted in real difficulties between us. So, if you want to get into the subject, it's there for that reason. How it impacted on my relationship with Joslyn, and the fact that our relationship, our marriage culminated in divorce. Subsequently, you know probably one of those things which is connected to the human psyche, and mental traits to some degree, and you know

MR. FLYNN: Hopefully, for procreation purposes.

A. Procreation purposes it can just be on

a chemical basis.

MR. FLYNN: I mean in order to keep the species going.

A. But, certainly in terms of sexual function or dysfunctions connected there sometime. So, I cannot state that everything is absolutely staggeringly wonderful all of the time. However, I am not making any claim that in any other relationship I've ever had what Scientology has done has impacted on my sexual function within those other relationships. Are we clear on that?

MR. BLUMENSON: No, not at

all.

MR. FLYNN: I'm make it real clear. It has to do with Joslyn and his marriage only. We're making no claim outside of that.

A. And, I'm not bringing up the subject.

MR. BLUMENSON: If you're claiming that there was damage to Mr.

Armstrong's sexual abilities during the Joslyn marriage, in that case, Mr. Tabb and I

stipulated last time that I would refrain from

asking until that was determined. Now that it
has been determined that you're claiming it as
a measure of damages, then you understand that
we'll have to resume the deposition on that
subject as well as these others.
MR. FLYNN: You have your
understandings, we have our understandings.
Hopefully someday there'll be a neutral
MR. GELLER: Record should
reflect that they're walking out the door.
MR. FLYNN: It's 4:34 by my
watch.
MR. GELLER: At 4:34 they
have walked out the door.
(Deposition concluded at
4:35)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMM	ONW	EAL	TH (OF M	IASSA	CHUSETTS
KNACEN ABADYON KNAKON HILDER	н арадын аралын курага	o empresi epiapour escaper-	unade ecopio setato es	STATES AND AND ADDRESS AND ADD	Dan distante visitatale valentite nationale va	нализм намерым поменую назвили нализмен изменую населения
COUN	TY	OF	SUFI	FOLK		

I, MICHELLE ROCK Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing deposition of GERALD ARMSTRONG was taken before me on October 30, 1986.

The said witness was duly sworn before the commencement of his testimony; that the said testimony was taken stenographically by myself and then transcribed. To the best of my knowledge, the within transcript is a true and accurate record of said testimony.

I am not connected by blood or marriage with any of the said parties, nor interested directly or indirectly in the matter in controversy.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and Notarial Seal this November, 1986.

PUBLIC

PLEASE NOTE:

THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF CERTIFYING REPORTER.